

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,435	04/09/2004	Prasanna J. Satarasinghe	31426.51	1235
86175 7590 0800A20099 Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP P.O. Box 10500			EXAMINER	
			LANIER, BENJAMIN E	
McLean, VA 22102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2432	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/821,435	SATARASINGHE ET AL.			
Examiner-induced interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	BENJAMIN E. LANIER	2432			
All Participants: Status of Application: After RCE					
(1) <u>BENJAMIN E. LANIER</u> .	(3)				
(2) Martin Sulsky (Reg. No. 45,403).	(4)				
Date of Interview: 30 July 2009	Time:				
Type of Interview: □ Telephonic □ Video Conference □ Personal (Copy given to: □ Applicant □ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: □ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description: □ No	cant's representative)				
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: n/a					
Claims discussed:					
Prior art documents discussed: n/a					
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:			
Part III.					
/Benjamin E Lanier/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2432	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)			

Application No. 10/821,435

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner called Mr. Sulsky to discuss the claim amendments (dated 07 July 2009) that require a conversion of non-alphanumeric octet values to alphanumeric octet values. Examiner stated that the specification was not enabling for the claims because the conversion discussed in the specification (Pages 7-8) did not convert the values as claimed. Mr. Sulsky stated that the specification includes a typographical error, and that the conversions disclosed (Pages 7-8) should be specific to the decimal values as caposed to the octect values. Examiner stated that he would go over the conversions with the repsect to the decimal values.